

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-22, and 24-40 are pending in the application. Claims 2 and 23 have been cancelled. In the Office Action mailed July 25, 2005, claims 1, 3-22, and 24-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US2004/0171396 (Carey et al, hereinafter "Carey").

**I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 1, 3-22, and 24-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carey. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. Carey does not anticipate the Applicants' invention, for at least the following reasons: Carey does not relate a receiver identifier to corresponding routing format information and Carey does not reformat only message routing information, leaving the message body unchanged.

The Applicants' invention is a method and apparatus for routing a particular message from a sender in a first digital mobile network to an intended receiver in a second, different digital mobile network by reformatting the original routing information associated with the message into a routing *format* that is *determined on a message-by-message basis, depending on the destination receiver identifier*, in order to allow transmission of the message between noncompatible digital mobile networks. This reformatting of the routing information is transparent to the sender and the receiver of the message, and the *message body remains unchanged* (specification, as published, at, e.g., paragraphs [0038], [0046], [0056]-[0057], [0062], and [0130]-[0131]). The Applicant's invention facilitates the transparent transmission of the message from the sender to the specified receiving mobile network. It does not require, or provide for, the creation of instant message names, address lists, or any other form of address translation; rather, only the address *format* is changed in order to allow transmission between networks with incompatible addressing protocols.

In contrast, in the method of Carey, provision is made for the creation, maintenance, and translation of lists of instant message names. The names are translated into destination addresses, in order to facilitate the transmission of instant messages from a mobile user to his or her mobile carrier. The concentration of the method of Carey is on the piece of the transmission system that resides between the user and his or her mobile carrier. Once a message is received

and properly directed by the carrier, Carey leaves the problem of actual transmission to the intended recipient to "known" methods. In Carey, no relation is made between the intended destination receiver and the addressing protocol needed to transmit a message to the receiver, because that is not part of the problem addressed by Carey. Instead, the problem of transmission of the message to a receiving carrier using a noncompatible addressing protocol is left for the mobile carrier to solve. The method of Carey is also quite different from the invention of the Applicants in that, to the extent that Carey performs reformatting, Carey reformats the entire message, including message content, whereas, in the method of the Applicants, only the message routing information is reformatted, not the message content itself. The steps of relating and forwarding of Carey, to the extent they exist, are therefore not equivalent to the claimed steps of relating and forwarding to a receiver of the Applicants, and the disclosure of Carey therefore does not disclose or render obvious the Applicants' invention, whether taken alone or in combination with any other art of record.

In particular, Carey fails to disclose the Applicants' step of "relating, using a routing database, a receiver identifier, the *receiver identifier* being contained in the associated message routing information and associated with the intended receiver, to *corresponding routing format information* associated with the second digital mobile network." To the extent that Carey is concerned with routing format at all, it is only to reformat every one of the user's messages according to the single, *predefined* protocol needed to transmit the message from the user's mobile device to the user's own mobile carrier [Carey at paragraph 0028] or from the user's mobile carrier to its associated instant message routing server [Carey at paragraph 0028]. Carey does not disclose, or even discuss, the problem of transmitting the message from that mobile carrier to one or more different, noncompatible mobile carriers in order to achieve delivery of the message. Rather than contemplating the problem solved by the Applicants' invention, transmission of SMS messages between any number of noncompatible mobile networks, Carey merely states "If the formatted data does not include address data assigned to an instant message routing server, the formatted data is probably an email message and is processed according to known cellular Short Message processing methods, block 88." In other words, Carey does not even attempt to address the problem solved by the Applicants' invention and, in fact, does not even discuss that part of the transmission process wherein the Applicants' invention is specifically employed, other than to refer to it as being handled by "known" techniques.

The Examiner has cited paragraphs 0024 and 0025 of Carey as showing the Applicants' element of relating. The only relating performed in this aspect of Carey's system is the relating of instant message names to corresponding destination addresses. Clearly, the relation of a message name to a destination address is not equivalent to the Applicants' relating of a receiver identifier with information about the *routing format* needed to route a message to that receiver. Relation of one address to an associated address is well known in the art, but bears no relationship to making the association between the receiver associated with a final destination address and the routing format required to reach that receiver. The fact that the relation of the message names to destination addresses is done at the short message service center, rather than at the user's device, does not render this aspect of Carey an equivalent for the Applicants' step of relating a receiver identifier to associated routing *format* information. The Applicants have further considered all the other sections of Carey carefully, and believe that they also fail to show the Applicants' step of relating a receiver identifier to corresponding routing format information, or any equivalent thereof.

Further, Carey fails to disclose the Applicants' step of "reformatting said associated message routing information in a format specified by said corresponding routing information, wherein the reformatting is transparent to a sender and receiver of the message and *the message body remains unchanged*". To the extent that Carey performs reformatting, albeit reformatting to only the single, "predefined protocol used to communicate information between the short message service center 32 and the instant message routing server 24" [Carey at paragraph 0028], it is clear from the discussion that the *entire* message of Carey is reformatted, not just the message routing information. Carey states in paragraph 0028 that "Then, the user enters *message content information* (either function related information or a message accordingly)." Carey goes on to state "Next, at block 82, *the user's selection and entered information* is formatted according to the predefined protocol and sent to the mobile carrier 34. At block 84, the mobile carrier receives *the formatted data* and sends the formatted data to the short message service center 32..." It is clear here that *all* of the entered information, including the "message content information" is formatted to become "*the formatted data*." Thus, when Carey goes on to say, in the section cited by the Examiner, "If *the formatted data* does include address data assigned to an instant message routing server 24, *the formatted data* is reformatted according to the predefined protocol used to communicate information between the short message service

center 32 and the instant message routing server 24...", it is clear that *the message content information entered by the user is reformatted*. This is therefore clearly not the equivalent of the Applicants' step of reformatting, which specifically requires that *the message body remains unchanged*.

In order to more particularly call out and define the Applicants' invention, the Applicants previously amended independent claims 1 and 22 to call out the step of reformatting said associated message routing information in a format specified by said corresponding routing format information, wherein the reformatting is transparent to a sender and receiver of the message and the message body remains unchanged and to clarify that the step of relating, using a routing database, relates a receiver identifier, the receiver identifier being contained in the associated message routing information and associated with the intended receiver, to corresponding routing format information associated with the second digital mobile network. This method of routing a message from a sender in a first digital mobile network to an intended receiver in a second, different digital mobile network is not shown in Carey nor in any other prior art.

The Applicants have carefully considered all parts of Carey, not just those sections noted by the Examiner, as well as all the other references of record. The Applicants believe that neither the Applicants' step of relating nor the Applicants' step of reformatting, as claimed, are disclosed in Carey, in any of the other references of record, or in any other prior art. The Applicants' invention is therefore not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Carey, by any other reference of record, or by any other prior art, whether taken alone or in combination. Allowance of claims 1 and 22, as amended, is therefore respectfully requested.

Because claims 3-21 depend from independent claim 1, which is in condition for allowance, the Applicants believe that claims 3- 21 are also in condition for allowance. Similarly, because claims 24-40 depend from independent claim 22, which is in condition for allowance, the applicants believe that claims 24- 40 are also in condition for allowance. Allowance of claims 3- 21 and 24-40 is therefore respectfully requested.

## **II Conclusion**

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-22, and 24-40 are in condition for allowance. For this reason, and in view of the foregoing arguments, the Applicants believe that

this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. As the Applicants are filing this response within two months of the mailing date of this Final Action, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue an Advisory Action should there remain any unresolved issues. It is also respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Norma E. Henderson, Applicants' Attorney, at 603-225-4334, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

Hinckley, Allen & Snyder LLP

September 26, 2005

Date

By: 

Norma E. Henderson

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Reg. No. 39,219

Norma E. Henderson, Esq.  
Hinckley, Allen & Snyder LLP  
43 North Main Street, 2nd floor  
Concord, NH 03301-4934  
Tel: 603-225-4334  
Fax: 603-224-8350